REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending. By this Response, the Figs. are corrected and claims 8, 21, 31 and 40 in the specification are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the indication of claims 2-4, 8, 9, 17, 18, 21, 27, 28, 31, 37 and 40 as containing allowable subject matter.

Drawings

The Office Action objects to Fig. 6 for including the same reference character for two separate elements within the figure. Applicants have corrected Fig. 6 and the specification on page 17 to correct for this error.

The Office Action also objects to Figs. 12A and 29 under 35 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) for including reference signs not mentioned within the specification. Applicants have removed reference signs 1222, 1224, 1226 and 1228 from Fig. 12A and included reference numeral 2910 at page 34 of the specification so that the drawings and the specification comply with 37 C.F.R. §.84(p)(5).

Further, the Office Action objects to the drawings for failing to include reference numeral 206 and 2600 which is described in the specification. Applicants have corrected Fig. 2 and 26 to include the respective reference numerals to correct the error.

Finally, the Office Action objects to Fig. 20 and Fig. 25 for minor spelling errors. Applicants have corrected these errors within the attached corrected drawings.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections in regard to the drawings.

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 8, 21, 31 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the term "approximately" used in the claims renders the claims indefinite. In response, applicants have amended claims 8, 21, 31 and 40 by deleting the term "approximately". Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Double-Patenting

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 16, 26 and 36 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent 6,633,573 in view of Ikawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,753). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states that although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because although claim 1 of the application comprises the additional step of controlling information

generating a massive interrupt signal. Nowhere in claims 1, 16, 26 and 36 of the present invention do the claims recite storing data frames in a first RAM area and setting at least one unit interrupt bit in a second RAM area and a third RAM area and then generating a massive interrupt signal. Thus, not only do claims 1 and 2 of the '573 patent not recite the step of controlling information routing but they recite several other features as indicated above not recited in claims 1, 16, 26 and 36 of the present invention. Therefore, the claims of the '573 patent and the claims of the present invention are clearly distinct from each other.

Also, the Examiner has failed to meet his burden in establishing obviousness-type double patenting. As stated in MPEP 804(2)(b)(1), any double patenting rejection should make clear: (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill would conclude that the invention defined in the claims in issue are an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claims of the patent.

First, the Office Action has failed to address the distinctive features including the recitation of the first RAM and setting at least one unit interrupt bit in a second RAM and third RAM in the generating of a massive interrupt signal recited in claim 1 of the '573 patent which are not recited in claims 1, 16, 26 and 36 of the present invention. Thus, the Examiner has not established the differences between the conflicting claims.

routing a response to the interrupt signal, Ikawa provides the step of controlling information in its bridging process when a mode mismatching is detected. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, applicants note that claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent 6,633,573 (hereinafter '573 patent) are directed to a method for generating massive interrupts in a random access memory whereas the claims in the present invention are concerned with routing network switching event information. Applicants see no parallel between the claims of the '573 patent and the present application. Applicants submit that claims 1, 16, 26 and 36 of the present application are different in scope and are distinct from claims 1 and 2 of the '573 application.

Specifically, claim 1 of the '573 patent recites receiving and storing a plurality of data frames comprising switching the net information in a first RAM area; performing compare operations among prespecified ones of a plurality of data frames; setting at least one unit interrupt bit in a corresponding location of a second RAM area in response to at least one detected bit difference resulting from the compare operation; setting at least one interrupt size bit in a corresponding location of a third RAM area in response to the set at least one unit interrupt bit and generating a massive interrupt signal in response to at least one set unit interrupt bit. Claim 1 of the '573 patent recites the storing of information in a first RAM area in the setting of an interrupt bit in a second RAM area and a third RAM area and then

Second, the Office Action has not provided a reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that claims 1, 16, 26 and 36 of the present application in an obvious variation of claims 1 and 2 of the '573 patent. The Office Action merely states that the claims are not identical and asserts that claim 1 of the present invention includes a further step of controlling information routing which Ikawa provides and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine Ikawa's teaching with claim 1 of the '573 patent. However, as indicated above, the Examiner has failed to address the features recited in claim 1 of the '573 patent which were not recited in claims 1, 16, 26 and 36 of the present application and thus has failed to provide reasons why one of ordinary skill would conclude the claims of the '573 patent are obvious variations of the claims of the present application.

Finally, applicants respectfully submit that the Ikawa reference teaches a mismatched judging unit which detects a mismatch in modes between two stations so that the modes can be synchronized so that stations can be bridged. Ikawa's bridging process does not provide a step of controlling information routing in response to an interrupt signal as provided in the claims of the present invention.

Thus, in view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 16, 26, and 36 of the present invention are distinct from claims 1 and 2 of the '573 patent. Accordingly, applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the non-statutory double-patenting rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5-7, 10-16, 19, 20, 22-26, 29, 30, 32-36, 38, 39 and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliot, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,470) in view Ikawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,753). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that Elliot teaches the claimed "generating at least one data frame of a second type from at least one data from of the first type, wherein the at least first data frame of the second type comprises switching event information and transferring and storing the at least one data frame of a second type among the plurality of network elements using a set second network". The Office Action states that Elliot, however, fails to teach "performing at least one compare operation among prespecified data frames of a second type, generating at least one interrupt signal in response to at least one detected change resulting from the at least one compare operation; and controlling information routing in at least one network in response to the at least one interrupt signal" and alleges that Ikawa makes up for the deficiencies of Elliot, the combination of Elliot and Ikawa providing applicant's claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Ikawa teaches a failure protection apparatus that detects a mode of a station and matches the mode with another station to form a synchronous communication network. Ikawa provides mode information in the k bytes

which can be detected by a mismatch judgment unit in order to know when a mode should be switched, so that an appropriate bridge can be established.

Applicants note that the mismatching judgment unit detects a specified value in a k byte. The mismatching judgment unit does not compare data received over specified data frames, as claimed by applicants. Further, the mismatching judgment unit reports to the APS processing unit when a detection occurs. The APS processing unit generates a control signal for matching the modes of the two (2) stations. An interrupt signal by which routing is controlled and the network, as claimed by applicants, is never generated or processed within the system of Ikawa.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ikawa's system is concerned with providing the means necessary so that modes between two stations communicating with each other are matched, thereby allowing data to be transmitted and received efficiently. Ikawa is not concerned with providing efficient means for providing switching event information by using an interrupt signal and a second or backplane network, as in the present invention.

Thus, the combination of Elliot and Ikawa fail to teach all the elements of the independent claims as indicated above. Therefore, Elliot and Ikawa fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, generating at least one data frame of a second type from at least one data frame of a first type, wherein the at least one data frame of a second type comprises switching event information; performing at least one compare operation among prespecified data frames or the second type;

generating at least one interrupt signal in response to at least detected change resulting from the at least one detected change resulting from the at least one compare operation; and controlling information routing and at least one network in response to the at least one interrupt signal, as recited in claims 1, 16, 26 and 36. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-43 are distinguishable over the cited references. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MRC/CJB:cb
4450-0218P

Attachment(s)